

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/563,554	04/14/2006	Jean-Bernard Fischer	0579-1112	1488
466 YOUNG & TI	7590 04/30/201 HOMPSON	EXAMINER		
209 Madison S		GELAGAY, SHEWAYE		
Suite 500 Alexandria, V.	A 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			2437	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/20/2010	ET ECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DocketingDept@young-thompson.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/563,554	FISCHER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
SHEWAYE GELAGAY	2437	

	SHEWAYE GELAGAY	2437					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 09 April 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
 N The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		20(a) and the annualist	a automolom fo a				
Extensions of time may be doubled untilled 37 GFR. 1.30(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 GFR.1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set for thin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR.1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be t	iled within two months	of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externation of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	appeal. Since a				
AMENDMENTS							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I They raise new issues that would require further col 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause				
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE:	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co.	mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		inpliant Americanient (102-324).				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided. 		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Emmanuel L. Moise/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437							

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument filed on 04/09/10 have been fully considred but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argued that Stahl teaches away from combination with other reference where the anomaly function is executed if the predetermined (previously stacked) value is unstacked. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Stahl teaches a method for ensuring the integrity of the stack during program execution including comparing the signautre word stored on the stack with the subroutine entry address code; passing control to the return address if the compared values are equal; and executing a software iterrupt if the compared values are not equal. Stahl explicitly teaches that if the compared value are not equal executing a software interrupt. However, Stahl does not teach the predetermined value is an address of being an address of anomaly processing function and removing said predetermined value from the instruction stack without executing processing function. Choi teaches protecting systems against stack attacks by inserting a canary word to the stack just before, the return address when a function has been called, and when the function returns. StackGuard checks the canary word. If the canaray word has not been changed, then the function progresses normally. Applicant's argument that Stahl teaches away is not persuasive Stahl and Choi as well as Applicant's invention relates to keeping the integrity of execution of a software specifically by keeping the the integrity of the stack. Therfore, they are related to the same problem being solved secure execution of a program. As discussed above, Stahl teaches ensuring integrity of stack during program execution by comparing the signature word stored on the satck and executing a software interrupt if the comapred values are not equal and therefore does not teach away from the other reference Choi teaches protecting the stack against attacks by checking a canary word and progressing with normal exeuction if the canary work has not been changed.